DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 487 CS 505 055

AUTHOR Ecroyd, Donald H.; Drummond, Caroline
TITLE Reading Aloud Is a Rhetorical Act.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (76th, Providence, RI, May 2-5, 1985); An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Colloquium on Communication (8th, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 1982).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Interpersonal Competence; Listening Comprehension; Literature Appreciation; *Oral Interpretation; *Oral Reading; *Reading Aloud to Others; *Rhetoric; *Speech Communication; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Reading aloud is a rhetorical act. Its purpose is always to communicate, which is a transactional form involving the oral reader and at least one real or imaginary listener. Whenever a person reads aloud, the reader has some intent of reading to someone. In all such situations, readers interpret orally for the mood and meaning that seem appropriate to their intent. Despite the recognized range and frequency of occurrence of oral reading, however, it is for some reason only infrequently considered as transactional communication--a rhetorical act. If a pedagogy that will develop competency in the transactional nature of communication through oral reading cannot focus on the source of the communication nor on the message. It must instead focus on the transactional relationship among the original writer, the reader who chooses to share something aloud, the listener, and the messages developed during the communication situation. The purpose and the value of such a pedagogy lie in the relationship of the reader and listener as they interact in the development of empathy and understanding. Between them, mood and meaning are constructed. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED260487

READING ALOUD IS A RHETORICAL ACT

by

Donald H. Ecroyd
and
Caroline Drummond

An invited paper presented for the Interpretation Interest Group at the Eastern Communication Association Convention, Providence, RI, May 1985.

The earlier version of this paper was presented at the Eighth International Colloquium on Communication, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 1982.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Caroline Drummond
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 055

READING ALOUD IS A RHETORICAL ACT

By Donald H. Ecroyd and Caroline Drummond

ABSTRACT

When one reads aloud, one reads to someone and has an intent in doing so. The transactional nature of the rhetorical act of reading aloud has only rarely been considered by teachers of oral interpretation. A padagogy which will develop communication competency in the rhetorical transaction of oral interpretation cannot focus primarily on the source, nor on the communicator, nor on the message. The focus of the study of oral reading should be upon the transactional relationship among the original writer, the reader who chooses to share something aloud, the listener, and the messages developed during the communication situation.

Donald H. Ecroyd is a Professor and Caroline Drummond is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Speech, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

READING ALOUD IS A RHETORICAL ACT

Over two thousand years ago, Aristotle observed that rhetoric finds its end in judgment.[1] One seeks out appropriate things to say and chooses specific strategies for communicating with someone in order to get that person to respond in some predetermined way. If I explain something to you, I want you to understand what I have said. If I offer persuasive arguments, I want you to believe or to act in the particular way that I have in mind. If I express my feelings to you, I want you to respond to them in the way that I expect of you and not in some unexpected way. If I share my dreams with you, or tell you a good joke, I want your empathy or perhaps your laughter. If I wave and call "Hello!" I want you to recognize me and smile or wave back.[2] I make rhetorical choices based upon my intent within the situation. The basic rhetorical question I ask myself is, "What shall I say to my listener(s) in this context?" The verbal or nonverbal strategies I choose in order to create a message that I may use to respond to that question depend upon both my intent and my sense of the situation in which I find myself. The actual communication between us, however, must be defined transactionally. The implication of this conceptual principle is that the meanings elicited during our communication interchange are of necessity always situational, always personal, and never twice the same. Whether I speak to you, sing to you, read aloud to you, or merely share with you a brief instant of eye contact, both my choice to do so and your choice of response are rhetorical; and the communication situation in which we find ourselves is transactional.

It is our contention, therefore, that reading aloud is a rhetorical act. Its purpose is always to communicate, which is a transactional form involving the oral reader and some listener or listeners -- real or imaginary. The test of its effectiveness does not lie in the oral reader's critical understanding of the written words being read. Nor does the test of its effectiveness lie in the range of vocal variety or the expressiveness of the body language brought to bear upon reading those words aloud. The test of its effectiveness is in the satisfaction of the reader's intent in entering the communication situation at all. Rhetoric, as Aristotle said, finds its end in judgment, and reading aloud is a rhetorical act.

Moreover, reading aloud is a frequently recurring rhetorical act integral to our daily communication. As an introductory exercise in an undergraduate course in Communicative Oral Reading, we regularly make an assignment across the first weekend of the class. We ask students to choose any single hour, and to make careful note of every instance during that brief time period in which someone reads aloud to them, they read aloud to someone else, or they observe someone reading aloud to someone. We ask for more than a tally. We also ask them to note who was reading to whom, and what was going on. During a recent term, a lecture section of 16 students noted a total of 88 such instances -- an average of 5.5 per hour. The range of individual observations was from 1 to 9. Included this year, as in other past years as well, were predictable instances of radio and television newscasts and commercial announcements; but also such widely varying items as reading off telephone numbers, addresses, or recipes to someone else -- sharing good bits from "Dear Abby" or a book -- observing a mother reading to a child on the subway -- having someone else read instructions step-by-step while one was carrying out an unfamiliar task -- even reading a romantic poem over the telephone as an effort to break the loneliness of distance on a winter's night.

Whenever one reads anything aloud, that person has some intent in doing so. In all such situations, the reader interprets orally for the mood and meaning that seem appropriate to his or her intent. Oral interpretation is generic, in other words, and cannot be limited just to reading literature aloud.

Paul Campbell, writing in the preface to his 1966 text, says

> Oral interpretation is one of the simplest things in the world. It is reading aloud a newspaper article to a friend, or reading aloud the minutes of a committee meeting, or reading aloud a letter you have received, or even reading aloud the signs and billboards that wheel past the car window.
>
> Oral interpretation is one of the most difficult things in the world. It is reading aloud a Dorothy Parker short story, and making the listener(s) feel the wit, and bite, and pain, or reading aloud a Tennessee Williams play, and making the hearer(s) aware of the twisting agony of the characters, or reading aloud an E. E. Cummings lyric, and making the audience feel the singing, sustained lines, and the hurt or happiness that lurks within them.
>
> Oral interpretation is all the things that lie between these two extremes. [3]

Despite the recognized range and frequency of occurence of oral reading, however, it is for some reason only infrequently considered as a transactional communication--a rhetorical act. To cite Campbell again, this time in the introduction to The Speaking and the Speakers of Literature, oral interpretation can be considered in a number of different ways. It can be a practical art; it can be an act of personal analysis and criticism of a piece of literature; it can be the performance of literature.[4] Of these three, Campbell elevates the critical and performance approaches, stressing the critical.

> . . .this book is an attempt to show how one may approach literature as a performer, primarily a performer for that most exclusive, demanding, and rewarding of audiences, the reader, himself--secondarily a performer for actual audiences of other people.[5]

Thus, even at the level of performance, the communicative aspect of oral reading is denigrated and virtually dismissed. As for the practical art of reading aloud, Campbell says,

> If one must make a book report to a class, or give a treasurer's report to a committee, one should have enough basic command of the language to be able to do so. However, it is difficult for this writer to see how a course--much less an academic area--on the college level can have such a goal.[6]

In other words, for Campbell oral interpretation is not primarily or importantly an act of communication, but is instead--to use his own term--an oralization of writing.

> Oral interpretation has as its primary goal, not performance before an actual audience, but a quickened and deeper response to, and appreciation of, literature. The only audience necessary for such a response is the reader, himself.[7]

Such a position is strangely inconsistent. On the one hand, Campbell defines oral interpretation as a frequently recurring form that has generic implications; but, on the other, he denies his own definition in favor of one that is both artificial and esoteric. To Campbell, the oral interpreter is somehow analogous to Narcissus, contemplating his own beauty. Thus, the pragmatic, transactional nature of communicative oral reading, which he clearly defines and recognizes, he then rejects.

Nor is Campbell the only important writer in the field of oral interpretation who has failed to recognize the inherently rhetorical nature of the common act of reading aloud. Thomas O. Sloan , in an article in the November, 1981, issue of Literature in Performance -- a journal whose title is in itself an argument in behalf of our point that oral reading should be considered a rhetorical act -- talks of the necessity of using principles of rhetoric to analyze fiction. Yet he does not consider the fact that reading fiction aloud is itself a rhetorical act. His position is curiously myopic -- and therefore he fails to realize the full potential of his own observations. Consider one of his opening paragraphs:

> Thus, the mode of analysis in what follows is rhetorical almost in the ancient and most pristine sense of rhetoric as the art of public speaking. As an analytical approach, traditional rhetoric offers the critical view that all discourse is talk, the critical reminder that talk always presupposes the presence of people, and the critical insistence that speaker-audience relations are strategic. The view, reminder, and insistence would seem to be most at home in the practice of performing literature.[8]

These sentences precede a highly readable and stimulating literary criticism of the authorial strategies of Eudora Welty and Flannery O'Connor in their short stories. The essay then concludes,

> It is, finally, rhetoric which I have been discussing, the means whereby the author makes her presence known to us. I began with the proposition that good fiction is good talk and with the further proposition that fiction performs its meaning. Then I endeavoured to put these two propositions together into a third: fiction must perform its meaning through talk. Moreover, those of us who actually perform fiction carry that third proposition to its literal extreme in investing the most strategic talker, the narrator, with a very real presence. So my ultimate question was, how does the narrator's presence reveal the author's? By means of these questions, rhetoric, with its ancient concerns for speakers and audiences, became my central analytical approach to this literature in performance.[9]

In other words, for Sloan the purpose of oral interpretation is not the rhetorical act of communication, but is instead the act of rhetorical criticism.

Let us review what Campbell and Sloan are saying to us. Campbell, on the one hand, admits that oral interpretation can be interpersonally communicative, but dismisses that transactional notion as somehow secondary to the intrapersonal critical process of oralizing. Sloan , on the other hand, recognizes that rhetorical choices play a vital role in the creation of literature, and urges that performance for an audience requires that the reader carry out a careful analysis of what the author's rhetorical processes actually were. But neither of these well-known authorities chooses to recognize oral reading as being primarily a communication transaction--a rhetorical act. Campbell and Sloan seem perverse in rejecting insights implicit in their own conceptual perspectives. Unfortunately the limited view of oral reading as narcissistic literary criticism and performance has become so prevalent as to color even the writings of those who have pragmatic purposes in discussing the act of communicative oral reading.

In 1978, The Catholic Truth Society, London publishers to the Holy See, brought out a slender volume called The Lector's Handbook. In this fascinating little booklet, Father J. D. Crichton writes,

> It will be clear from what has been said above that the reader is essentially a communicator. He (or she) stands before the people to convey to them the word of God. His first concern then must be that his reading is intelligible and the first step in his preparation must be a psychological one. Like a preacher, he has to reach out mentally to the people to whom he wishes to communicate the message of the day. He has to remember the very varied composition of any church congregation, the older people whose minds move more slowly than others', the hard-of-hearing, the mother with restless children and yet others who are (still) somewhat detached observers. He has to reach them and if he realises this, then the pitch of his voice, the phrasing of the sentences and his whole attitude are likely to be right.[10]

A few pages further on, however, Father Crichton adds,

> Reading aloud is a great art, only acquired and maintained by constant practice. Even actors who have received speech-training rehearse their readings, tape-recording themselves, listening with care, so as to improve enunciation, phrasing, rise and fall of voice, expression, etc.. . . .
> Therefore the first thing to dismiss is an idea, lurking at the back of many minds, that reading aloud is easy and is something we are supposed to have been able to do since the age of eight.[11]

Once more the focus is clearly upon something other than the speaker/reader-listener transaction. Campbell and Sloan would have us truncate oral reading to a combined focus on speaker-as-performer, who must critically evaluate a piece of literature in order to create an artistic literary message. Father Crichton would have us focus on the speaker-as-performer who must make himself or herself audible, comprehensible, and thereby "eliminate the sort of reading that sounds as if it were a private enterprise between the reader and (perhaps) God."[12] To Father Crichton the reader may indeed seem a communicator, but there is no awareness of the rhetorical act of communication through oral reading--no awareness of the transactional nature of the development of meaning. If one is a communicator, he seems to believe, one's job is to make oneself audible, to look at one's listeners as one speaks to them, and to rehearse the message in order that it may be delivered in a way that can be understood by all who choose to listen. Communication is thus defined as an action, not a transaction.

In a few pages addressed "to the Listener," Charlotte Lee and Timothy Gura comment in the most recent edition of Oral Interpretation that "Much has changed in the field of oral interpretation since the first edition of this book appeared in 1952." However, they continue in the next paragraph,

> The fundamental theory of the book remains the same: only when a student fully understands a literary selection can any reliable performance preparation begin. Thus we have continued our emphasis on the analysis of literary selections as a guide to their appreciation and, more immediately, as the indispensable first step of any rehearsal. The process of analysis described here emphasizes the writer's relationship with the reader and the position the interpreter takes in recounting the experience, whether that experience is an author's personal discovery or the sensibilities of a created character. In addition to an awareness of the work's complexities, oral performance demands a flexible voice and body able to suggest all the subtleties discovered through close analysis. Throughout the process, the only reliable yardstick of the success of performance remains the text itself. Thus, interpreters and critics have as their ultimate recourse that with which they began: the literature being performed.[13]

In other words, in the various revisions and editions across a thirty year period, the basic perspective of Lee's popular text has not changed. The notion of oral reading as a transaction -- as a rhetorical act -- is mentioned but is not seriously examined. Even in the current edition of the book, there

is no focus upon the speaker/reader-listener relationship and the way in which meaning is developed within it. Instead focus is -- as it has been since 1952 -- upon "the literature being performed." According to John Kepler Lea's 1975 doctoral study, Lee's text was the most widely used of any of the 31 textbooks then in print.[14] There is no reason to assume its popularity has significantly waned, since the book is now in its sixth edition. How strange and how sad that despite tremendous shifts in the understanding of communication transactions and of contemporary rhetoric, Lee would choose to leave her influential book in the intellectual context of thirty years ago. It seems equally shocking that the book continues to have the tremendous academic following that it commands, despite its failure to recognize that oral reading is a rhetorical act -- and that the "ultimate recourse" therefore cannot be "the literature performed" but must be the communication transaction itself.

Jere Veilleux takes this same philosophic position, that oral interpretation is a performance of literature rather than a communication transaction. Consider the following forthright declaration from one of his essays: "Oral interpretation is essentially a liberal art: a speech approach to the understanding and appreciation of literature."[15] A few scattered sentences from the same essay, dealing with the nature of the interpreter's audience, reinforce the notion that Veilleux, like Campbell, Sloan , Crichton, and Lee, does not see oral reading as being transactional. Communication from the printed page is clearly viewed from the perspective of a response model.

> The closest analogy to the interpretative audience is that of the symphonic audience. There, too, the emphasis is auditory, the language emotive, the material often familiar; they re-create their own patterns of imaginative response. . . . The audience's response to a "good" symphonic performance is necessarily a function of their individual subjective reactions (what the music "means" to them personally), though they may all applaud at the same time. . . .
>
> The nature of the audience, then, as it responds to oral interpretation, is different from that of other audiences. Its imagination is necessarily more active than in the theatre, and its response is likely to be more harmonious than in the forum. Perhaps the audience's active commitment to understanding the literature tends to reinforce the probability of its common response. . . .
>
> . . . The telling of written literature not only brings it to life, but makes it a social event.[16]

Veilleux's position seems to be that the oral reader (performer) should be trained to provide a stimulus to listener(s). This audience is then to experience the presented stimulus and respond to it. While the response model

of communication is perhaps closer to the reality of oral interpretation as a rhetorical transaction that is the action model of Campbell, Sloane, Crichton, and Lee, it still falls short of that reality.

When oral reading is considered in the light of contemporary rhetoric, such statements as those of Campbell, Sloan , Crichton, Lee, and Veilleux seem incomplete. Moreover, they fail to recognize the importance of reading aloud as a frequently recurring form of communication -- a rhetorical genre within its own right, capable of being defined and analyzed in comparison with other definable rhetorical acts. Contrast their statements with our position as published in Communicate Through Oral Reading:

> Speaking and oral reading are both communicative acts. Human beings are concerned with both the creation and the re-creation of moods and meanings. Sometimes they do these things by sharing the printed words of others directly. Sometimes they do these things by sharing the printed words of others indirectly, discussing and applying what they have read. Experience, thought, listening, speaking, and reading are all parts of an interactive process, and that process exists as part of the stream of culture itself.
>
> The study of oral reading as an act of communication raises for the communicator precisely the same rhetorical questions as the study of interpersonal communication or even public speaking: What can I say at this moment to these people about this idea? An oral reader who bears this question in mind uses his or her artistic sensitivity, reading techniques, and ability to create messages in a receiver-oriented way. Although much of the analysis necessary for artistic message preparation is still essential, the notion of reading to someone and for a purpose makes the reader-communicator attentive to feedback at every stage--from preparation through actual delivery of the message. [17]

According to a 1974 survey conducted by Carlsen, Murray, and Wells,[18] the primary goals of instruction in oral reading were noted as follows (a teacher could obviously check more than one answer):

understanding and appreciation of literature	67.7%
improvement of artistic performance abilities	55%
development of effective communication	55%

These figures would seem to indicate that teachers of oral interpretation are concerned with impression (a literature-centered orientation), but are also interested in teaching modes of expression (a speaker-centered orientation) and communication (a transactional orientation). Fifty-five per cent of the group responding to the questionnaire placed prime importance on learning to read aloud communicatively to others. It is probably testimony to the power

of the traditional oral interpretation textbooks that two-thirds of those teachers responding see their pedagogical goals as lying in the discipline of the field of English rather than speech communication. It is our point of view that 100% of the responses should have indicated that the purpose of teaching oral interpretation is the development of communication competency. Subordinated to that competency, the other two goals listed make sense; substituted for that competency, they do not. Also, it must be assumed that if 55% of these respondents feel that the "development of effective communication" is a primary goal of instruction in oral reading, 45% do not. Such a figure is shocking. If it is indeed accurate, we must conclude that 45% of the teachers of oral interpretation do not know what they are doing, or we must conclude that something very strange is being done in the name of speech communication.

Oral interpretation can be taught with emphasis on impression, of course. Such a pedagogical approach would probably lead to an increased understanding and appreciation of literature -- surely a desirable goal. It is also true that oral interpretation can be taught with an emphasis on expression. Such a pedagogical approach would probably lead to the improvement of artistic performance abilities -- again, a desirable goal. We even believe that these approaches can be combined so that (to quote the title of Leland Roloff's textbook)[19], "the perception and evocation of literature" become the focus, and students become both better literary critics and better performers of literature -- these, too, are desirable goals. But oral reading is such a frequent and integral part of human communication that it should not merely be studied as a melding of close literary analysis, the study of voice and diction, and rudimentary acting concepts. Oral reading should be studied as a rhetorical act.

If a pedagogy is to be developed which will focus on the transactional nature of communication through oral reading, it cannot focus on the source of the communication nor on the message. It must instead focus on the transactional relationship among the original writer, the reader who chooses to share something aloud, the listener, and the messages developed during the communication situation.[20] The silent reader who would share with others what he or she has read must consider both message analysis and performance skills, but must do so in relationship to intent and the pragmatics of the situation. In other words, oral reading is a rhetorical act. Its purpose is to influence. Its process is transactional.

The purpose and the value of the pedagogy developed from a consideration of reading to others as a communication transaction--a rhetorical act--lie in the relationship of the reader and listener as they interact in the development of empathy and understanding. Between them mood and meaning are constructed. The message of the original author is always tempered by the understanding, the communicative intent, and the skill of the oral reader--but it is tempered by the receptive stance, attention, and sensitivity of the listener as well. To quote Ecroyd and Wagner again,

> That which is understood from what the original writer intended is mutually developed at the moment it is spoken and heard. By the acts of speaking and listening, both oral reader and hearer are affected.[21]

Communicative oral reading is an area in which competency can and should be developed, for all the same practical reasons that one develops communication competency in interpersonal speaking, small group interaction, or public speaking. The nature of humanness involves communication. In a society where the written word is the custodian of culture, of science, of philosophy, communicative oral reading becomes an obviously desirable and useful personal skill--a necessary attribute of the educated person. In the field of speech communition presently there is strong research interest in discourse analysis of all kinds. Oral interpretation specialists have long analyzed genres of literature-as-discourse, but for the most part they have failed to recognize that communicative oral reading is itself a common form of discourse. Campbell and Jamieson, in Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action, urge that recurrent forms be identified; and, once discerned, that they be compared with other rhetorical acts.[22] Communicative oral reading clearly needs to be the subject of this sort of research.

One of the recommendations of the New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development (1968) was that our discipline accept the following description of research in speech communication:

> Research in speech-communication focuses on the ways in which messages link participants during interactions. Emphasis is on the behavioral antecedents and consequences of messages and their variations, as well as on the ways that messages interact with communication participants to produce behavioral outcomes.[23]

Clearly one paradigm of symbolic communication including many complex variables is the rhetorical transaction we know as communicative oral reading.

In his "Reflections on the Wingspread Conference," Lloyd Bitzer comments on the direction of contemporary rhetorical study.

> . . . Rhetorical methods should be regarded as not essentially linked with speeches or with any kind of public or interpersonal messages. It is true that we have been and should continue to be students of messages, which usually involve method. But we should remember that rhetorical method operates in stages prior to the creation and presentation of a message, and frequently it has operated even when no message was generated or uttered. I mean that methods of analysis, information collection, internal deliberation, meditation, and argumentation occur as parts of the rhetorical process--even when the final stage of message creation and presentation is omitted. We must understand also that conventional messages comprise only one of numerous outcomes of rhetorical method. The use of method may terminate in a decision, or an act, or a work of art.[24]

Reading aloud to others is a personal culmination of rhetorical method that may indeed terminate "in a decision, or an act, or a work of art;" and rhetoric as method should be more fully and carefully applied to its study than is the case today.

Reading aloud to others is a frequently used form of communication, and the development of communication competency in its skills would seem imperative in view of that frequency with which the form recurs in our literate society. To study oral interpretation as an approach to the study of literature, or as a performing art, should not be the only possibilities. As Carroll Arnold has written, "Attempted influence with practical goals in view is rhetoric, no matter what the form."[25] Reading aloud <u>is</u> a rhetorical act.

NOTES

[1] Aristotle, The Rhetoric, Lane Cooper, translator and editor (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1932), 2:1, p. 91.

[2] The five functions of communication, based on a system derived from the research of Gordon Wells, are said to be controlling, sharing feelings, informing, ritualizing, and imagining. See Barbara S. Wood, Children and Communication (2nd. ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1981), p. 261 and following.

[3] Paul N. Campbell, Oral Interpretation (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. ix.

[4] Paul N. Campbell, The Speaking and Speakers of Literature (Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 2-5.

[5] Campbell, Speaking and Speakers, p. 11.

[6] Campbell, Speaking and Speakers, p. 3.

[7] Campbell, Speaking and Speakers, p. 10.

[8] Thomas O. Sloan , "The Strategies of Authorial Presence: Narrators and Regionalism in Flannery O'Connor and Eudora Welty," Literature in Performance, 2, No. 1 (November, 1981), p. 2.

[9] Sloan , p. 24.

[10] Father J. D. Crichton, Father Reginald C. Fuller, and Mrs. Marie Anderson, The Lector's Handbook (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1978), p. 5.

[11] Handbook, p. 8.

[12] Handbook, p. 5.

[13] Charlotte I. Lee and Timothy Gura, Oral Interpretation (6th ed.) (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982), p. xvii.

[14] John Kepler Lea, "Methods of Instruction in the Basic or Only Oral Interpretation of Literature Course at the College Level," Diss. University of Maryland, 1975, p. 45.

[15] Jere Veilleux, "The Interpreter: The Nature of His Art," in Perspectives on Oral Interpretation: Essays and Readings, ed. John W. Gray (Minneapolis: Burgess, 1968), p. 27.

[16] Veilleux, pp. 26-27.

[17] Donald H. Ecroyd and Hilda Stahl Wagner, Communicate Through Oral Reading (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), p. 5.

[18] James Carlsen, LaDonna Murray, and Judith Wells, "Oral Interpretation in Undergraduate Education: A Survey," Speech Teacher 23, March, 1974, p. 156.

[19] Leland H. Roloff, The Perception and Evocation of Literature (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973).

[20] This concept has been developed in detail, with an accompanying communication model, in Ecroyd and Wagner, pp. 8-11.

[21] Ecroyd and Wagner, p. 11.

[22] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action, published by the Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, #E, Annandale, VA 22003, 1977. See especially p. 8, and pp. 25-28.

[23] Conceptual Frontiers in Speech-Communication. Report of the New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development, published by the Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, #E, Annandale, VA 22003, edited by Robert J. Kibler and Larry L. Barker, 1969, p. 33.

[24] Included in The Prospect of Rhetoric, Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black, editors (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 202-203.

[25] Carroll C. Arnold, "Reflections on the Wingspread Conference," in The Prospect of Rhetoric, p. 195.